

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Client/Project: South Mountain Corridor Study Citizens Advisory Team

Date: June 24, 2004

Time: 5:30 p.m.

Location: Laveen Elementary
School, Building A

CAT Members Attending:

Rock Argabright, Ahwatukee Foothills Village
Planning Committee
Carlie Billen Back, South Mountain/Laveen Chamber
of Commerce
Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA
Jim Buster, City of Avondale
Chad Campbell, Sierra Club
Ron Chohamin, Lakewood HOA

Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee
Michael Goodman, Phx Mtns Preservation Council
Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce
Robert Moss, United Arizona Dairymen
Wayne Nelson, GRIC District 7
Nathaniel Percharo, I-10 Pecos Landowners
Laura Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible
Development
Julia Shepherd, City of Tolleson
Mary Thomas, Gila River Indian Community

Staff and Consultants Attending:

Kevin Biesty, ADOT
Matt Burdick, ADOT
Amy Edwards, HDR
John Godec, GRA
Theresa Gunn, GCI
Bill Hayden, ADOT
John Roberts, GRIC
Floyd Roehrich, ADOT
Bill Vachon, FHWA
Shannon Wilhelmsen, ADOT

Special Guests:

Don Herp, City of Phoenix
Senator Slade Mead
Representative John Huppenthal

Citizens:

Richard C. Hernandez
Nicole Waldron
Nadine Shelde
Albert Pablo
George Anderson
Eric Booth
Tom Smith
Stacy Courtright
Tom King
George Prall
Pat Biggs
Shea Stickler

Brendon Bernardi
Nedra Lindy
Ramey Peru
Kent & Jenna Oertle
Tim Steele
Chris Bale
William Ramsay
Greta Rogers
Todd Heinle

Meeting Summary: Debbie Fink, GCI

ACTION PLAN:

Task/Activity	Who	When
Schedule next meeting at GRIC's Shelde Center	John	
Bring I-10 improvement map and visual comparisons to next CAT meeting		
Provide current traffic counts compared to historical projections.		
Research what other regional peer cities are building large freeway projects		

Welcome and Introductions:

John Godec began the meeting by explaining the Citizen's Advisory Team process which began over two years ago. At a previous meeting the citizen members agreed to open the meetings to the public. They have asked that the meetings not become a public hearing and/or debate. Therefore, only written comments are being taken tonight.

CAT Member Questions/Comments:

Question: This was asked at the beginning of the process. How much weight does the City of Phoenix have in the decision process? **Response:** Public and political acceptability is one of 33 items considered by the EIS.

Comment: Laveen zoning cases have been approved with and without freeway options.

Question: Estrella Village has only one development that has reserved land for the freeway.

Briefing on City of Phoenix Issues:

Don Herp, City of Phoenix, gave some history of the resolution passed by the City of Phoenix in December 2003.

- The city passed the resolution in support of the original alignment along 61st Avenue that was designated in 1985 and 1988.
- The City of Phoenix has not adopted any resolution regarding the Pecos Road portion.

- There is a lot of development in the area of the 55th Avenue alignment and Phoenix has not set aside enough land for the proposed current design.

Project Status:

- Once the EIS alternative is identified and a record of decision received, if it is different from the 1985/1988 alternative, the alternative would have to be adopted by the Maricopa Association of Governments and the State Transportation Board.
- If the alternative approved through the record of decision is not adopted by MAG, the “no-build” option would be implemented.

Alternative Naming Protocol:

Amy Edwards presented two options for naming the three alternatives and options.

- Option 1: Alphanumeric
 - Preface each with a W(West) or E(East) with a number from east and options would be A and B. For each variation within the alternatives or options, a letter or number would be assigned for description, tracking and analysis purposes.
- Option 2: Descriptive
 - Alternatives and options labeled by connection locations (Loop 101, 71st Avenue, 55th Avenue). Variations within each alternative would then add to the description. For example partial reconstruction of the Loop 101/I-10 interchange versus full reconstruction.

CAT Member Questions/Comments:

- Consider a combination such as W1-51.
- Uses too many technical terms which are confusing to the public.
- Only care if it is coming through my neighborhood.
- Reference connection but no other technical terms such as full and partial.
- Consider referencing where it splits off on the south and connects to I-10.
- Need to update the map, some of the new areas in Ahwatukee are not included and if possible, map some of the proposed GRIC plans for south of Pecos.
- Name shouldn't be longer than map.

- Put the jurisdiction boundaries on the map with the alignments.
- Project team will provide sample maps for the CAT to help determine what elements should be shown on the base map.
- Has this been given a familiar name? **Response:** It's considered Loop 202-South Mountain.
- How many feet past power line corridor are needed for the freeway? **Response:** Still in design. We will have options of how to go through South Mountain as part of the east segment analysis.
- Just because something is being studied doesn't mean it is a given. We can study to identify impacts and possibly eliminate problems.

Conclusions:

- Look to develop a naming protocol that is descriptive of geographic variations and minimizes reference to technical variations.

1985/1988 Design Assumptions:

Amy presented an overview of the historical data vs. current data. The 1985 Central Area Transportation Plan developed the corridor. The alignment was developed in the 1988 EA and Design Concept Report.

- 1988 estimated 2005 population of 2.9 million. That is about ½ million less than today's 2005 estimates of 3.4 million.
- 1985/1988 looked at 99th Avenue, 75th Avenue, 59th Avenue, 63rd Avenue, 53rd Avenue, 55th Avenue, and 51st Avenue alignments.
- 1985 looked at Pecos Road, Queen Creek Road and Riggs Road. In 1988, it was decided to only consider Pecos Road because traffic volumes dropped off dramatically the further south.
- 1985-88 looked at 2015 traffic projections. We have 2025 traffic projection data and have requested 2030.
- 1985 plan traffic model only estimated 16,000 vehicles in 2015 at 99th Avenue and 2025 estimate is about 121,000.
- The Pecos Road estimate was 96,000 in 2015. In 1985/88 the 2025 estimate is 141,000.
- In 1988 the traffic at 51st Avenue projection for 2015 was 92,400 and today, the projection for 2025 is 155,000.
- 1988 estimated 3 miles of improvement along I-10. Today estimate 9 miles of improvements needed along I-10.
- **Question:** Why are I-10 improvements needed? **Response:** To bring 120,000 vehicles into I-10 we need to bring South Mountain ramps into the mainline and have frontage roads to maintain local access.

- **Question:** How do we justify the expanded I-10 improvements when they were not included in the RTP? **Response:** RTP is based on a high level of planning vs. the EIS which includes detailed engineering plans.
- **Question:** What data was used to select 1985/1988? **Response:** Traffic demand dropped off further west and based on demand, 53rd Avenue seemed to be the best location at that time.
- **Question:** Have we already paid for South Mountain? What happens if voters pass the RTP funding and the South Mountain still isn't built? **Response:** Projects are prioritized and planned based on a snapshot of what ADOT thinks can be built with the projected revenues and audited twice a year.
- **Question:** What other regional peer cities are building large freeway projects. **Response:** It would be very difficult to compare the traffic patterns and transportation needs of other cities.

Public Questions & Comments:

- Shea Stickler, Citizen

Question: Since the onset of this project/committee, how many new homes have been sold and build between 38th Avenue to 99th Avenue north of Dobbins and South of I-10?

Question: How many homes are sold/built between each meeting; and by the time the project is defined, how much money will have been expended buying up newly sold land to make way for the route?

Response: We are not sure.

- Shea Stickler

Question: If this project is to be funded by a county sales tax; where is the county's representation and what is its viewpoint?

Response: Monthly Progress Team meetings are held and there are local and county representatives at those meetings. The intent of the CAT was to have representation from the general public.

- J. Pima, Citizen

Question: At what point will the pursuit of "other" alternative routes be closed in the decision-making process? When will the draft report be published?

Response: Draft EIS identifies preferred alternatives and final selection is the Record of Decision. Draft EIS for the West side would be early next year and full draft by end of 2005 depending on East side alternatives. The study has been boiled down to 3 reasonable build alternatives on the west side.

- J. Pima

Comment: When my neighborhood does not show upon a map that is supposed to represent the route's impact on my neighbors, you send the message that we aren't important.

Response: The team routinely updates aerial maps of the study area. Maps shown tonight were schematic and not intended to show every neighborhood. Technical analysis uses more detailed maps. West Side changes are happening rapidly and we work to stay current.

- Chris Bale, Citizen

Question: Has the FHWA been involved in the design/construction of other non-interstate freeways?

Response: Yes.

Question: Will this section of the 202 receive more funding from the Federal Government? If so, is this whole process being additionally held up because this freeway is I-10 to I-10?

Response: The process makes this freeway eligible for federal money. Conducting a federal level EIS to make it eligible for federal money is a state decision. The Red Mountain and Santan freeways have all gone through NEPA process.

- Tim, Citizen

Question: Do the traffic projections reflect the distribution of traffic bypassing Phoenix versus "internal" (within the county) traffic? Which use has priority in terms of routing (i.e., Pecos, Queen Creek, Riggs)?

Response: Traffic numbers are for total traffic. We have estimated the percentage that is pass through vs. local. We have not studied traffic for Queen Creek or Riggs Road because they are not part of the current analysis.

- Kent Oertle, Citizen

Question: We need a traffic study that is current in order to plan properly. How long would it take to complete a traffic analysis which includes 30-year population projects? Since it will take 10-15 years to complete, 30-year projections may not be enough.

Response: In the past we have used 20-year projections and are now change to 25-year projections to meet traffic needs 20 years after the project is built. MAG is working to establish a model that can handle 2030. We do not have an estimate of when we will get the 2030 from MAG.

NEXT CAT MEETING:

- July 22, 2004
- Shelde Center

Topics:

- I-10 connection; I-10 West
- GRIC master plan presentation